#### 105TH CONGRESS 1ST SESSION

# H. R. 882

To reduce the risk of oil pollution and improve the safety of navigation in San Francisco Bay by removing hazards to navigation, and for other purposes.

### IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

February 27, 1997

Mr. Miller of California (for himself, Ms. Pelosi, Mr. Filner, Ms. Eshoo, Ms. Woolsey, Mr. Dellums, Mr. Stark, and Mrs. Tauscher) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure

## A BILL

To reduce the risk of oil pollution and improve the safety of navigation in San Francisco Bay by removing hazards to navigation, and for other purposes.

- 1 Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-
- 2 tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,
- 3 SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.
- 4 This Act may be cited as the "San Francisco Bay
- 5 Shipping and Fisheries Enhancement Act of 1997".
- 6 SEC. 2. FINDINGS.
- 7 The Congress finds the following:

- (1) San Francisco Bay is a vital environmental,
   industrial, and recreational resource to the San
   Francisco Bay area and to the Nation.
  - (2) Over 800 tank vessels enter San Francisco
    Bay each year, carrying hundreds of millions of gallons of oil and other hazardous substances.
    - (3) The small oil spill of October 28, 1996, showed that current safeguards against oil pollution are inadequate, and that even small oil spills in San Francisco Bay are both costly to mitigate and harmful to the environment, including fish, mammals, and birds.
  - (4) Because of the bathymetry of San Francisco Bay, the Coast Guard has been unable to make needed improvements in the routing of tankers and other deep draft vessels.
  - (5) The presence of multiple underwater hazards less than 40 feet below the surface and in close proximity to shipping lanes, combined with increased traffic of tankers with drafts in excess of 45 feet, significantly increase the likelihood of collisions that would result in the release of substantial amounts of oil or other hazardous substances, severely damaging both the economy and the environment of the San Francisco Bay area.

1 (6) Removing hazards to navigation to allow 2 greater separation of vessels carrying oil or other 3 hazardous substances is a simple and economical 4 step that can be taken to reduce substantially the 5 risk of oil pollution, improve the safety of naviga-6 tion, and reduce threats to the fish, wildlife, and en-7 vironment of San Francisco Bay.

#### 8 SEC. 3. NAVIGATIONAL IMPROVEMENTS.

- 9 (a) In General.—The Secretary of the Army shall
- 10 develop and carry out in accordance with this section a
- 11 navigation project in San Francisco Bay, California, to re-
- 12 move underwater hazards to navigation in the vicinity of
- 13 Alcatraz Island.
- 14 (b) Rerouting of Vessel Traffic.—The Sec-
- 15 retary shall design the navigation project under this sec-
- 16 tion to facilitate the rerouting of vessel traffic in San
- 17 Francisco Bay to minimize the risk of an oil or hazardous
- 18 substance spill resulting from collisions between vessels or
- 19 with an underwater hazard.
- 20 (c) Minimization of Impact.—In developing and
- 21 carrying out the navigation project under this section, the
- 22 Secretary shall minimize, to the maximum extent prac-
- 23 ticable, impacts on the environment and on commercial
- 24 and recreational fisheries.
- 25 (d) Plan.—

- 1 (1) GENERAL REQUIREMENT.—In consultation
  2 with appropriate Federal, State, and local govern3 ment agencies and in accordance with applicable
  4 Federal and State environmental laws, the Secretary
  5 shall develop a plan for implementation of the navi6 gation project under this section.
  - (2) Contents.—The plan shall include initial design and engineering, underwater hazard removal, and, if needed, environmental mitigation.

#### (3) Target dates.—

- (A) FEASIBILITY STUDY.—The first phase of the plan shall be completed within 1 year of the date of the enactment of this Act and shall consist of a feasibility study for the project described in subsection (a). The feasibility study shall include scoping, development of alternative designs for the project, cost/benefit analysis, and selection of final project design. In conducting the cost/benefit analysis and selecting a final project design, the Secretary shall consider the economic and environmental benefits of oil spill aversion reasonably to be expected from the completion of the project.
- (B) IMPLEMENTATION.—The second phase of the plan shall be completed not later than 3

- years after the date of the enactment of this

  Act and shall consist of underwater hazard removal, transportation, and disposal of the removed material in accordance with the final
  project design.
  - (C) MITIGATION AND MONITORING.—The final phase of the plan shall consist of any mitigation needed due to environmental impacts, and environmental monitoring of removal, disposal, and mitigation sites (if different from the disposal site or sites), shall commence as soon as is practicable after the completion of the implementation phase, and shall continue for not less than 5 years thereafter.
- 15 (e) Non-Federal Participation.—The non-Fed-16 eral share of the cost of developing and carrying out the 17 project under this section shall be 25 percent.
- 18 (f) Reports to Congress.—Not later than the last 19 day of each of the time periods referred to in subsection 20 (d)(3), the Secretary shall report to Congress on the 21 progress being made toward development and implementa-22 tion of the project under this section.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

#### 1 SEC. 4. MODIFICATION OF NAVIGATION LANES.

- 2 The Commandant of the Coast Guard shall modify
- 3 navigation lanes and reroute vessel traffic after the com-
- 4 pletion of the second phase of the navigation project re-
- 5 quired by section 3 to improve the safety and efficiency
- 6 of vessel traffic in San Francisco Bay, California. In car-
- 7 rying out this section, the Commandant shall develop a
- 8 vessel routing program that minimizes the risk of an oil
- 9 or hazardous substance spill in San Francisco Bay.

#### 10 SEC. 5. OIL SPILL RISK ASSESSMENT.

- 11 (a) Survey.—In consultation with the Federal Mari-
- 12 time Administration, the Commandant of the Coast Guard
- 13 shall survey vessels owned by, or operated under contract
- 14 for, the Federal Maritime Administration for risks for oil
- 15 spills or other hazards to human health or the environ-
- 16 ment.
- 17 (b) STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES.—In surveying
- 18 vessels under this section, the Commandant shall use the
- 19 same standards and procedures as are used in inspecting
- 20 similarly situated private vessels.
- 21 (c) Report.—Not later than 1 year after the date
- 22 of the enactment of this Act, the Commandant shall sub-
- 23 mit to Congress and the Administrator of the Federal
- 24 Maritime Administration a report describing any oil spill
- 25 risks determined in the survey conducted under this sec-
- 26 tion and making recommendations for corrective actions

- 1 for such risks, including estimates of the costs of those
- 2 actions.

#### 3 SEC. 6. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

- 4 For fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1997,
- 5 there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary
- 6 of the Army and the Commandant of the Coast Guard
- 7 such sums as may be necessary to carry out their respec-
- 8 tive duties under this Act. Such sums shall remain avail-
- 9 able until expended.

 $\bigcirc$